

Rev A. Norton

THE
SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETER.

VOL. VI.] JUNE 15, 1836. [NO. VI.

CONTENTS.

Translation and Exposition.—Matt. xx. 17—34,	-	241
Jephthah's Vow.—Judges xi.	- - - -	248
Hug's Introduction to the New Testament,	- -	261
On the Gift of Tongues,	- - - -	274
On the Beauties of the Old Testament,	- - -	280
Translation from J. E. Collier's Introduction to the Old Testament,	- - - - -	288

B O S T O N :
PUBLISHED BY OTIS, BROADERS & CO.,
147 Washington Street.
1836.

PROSPECTUS OF THE SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETER.

NEW SERIES.

E. R. BROADERS, PUBLISHER,
NO. 147 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

The present number commences a new volume of this Periodical. The purpose of the work and the character of its contents will be the same as heretofore. There will be no connexion with this and the preceding volumes except that the Translations and Expositions will be continued in regular order.

The object of this Publication will be to afford to Sunday School Teachers and Parents, and also to other Christians, facilities towards a right understanding and use of the Bible, and particularly of the New Testament. It will contain translations of different passages and of whole books of the New Testament, with expositions and such critical and practical remarks as may be thought useful. It will also offer to the reader short essays on the nature of the scriptural writings, their literary character, critical peculiarities, historical, biographical, and ecclesiastical uses and value. The work is not designed to be controversial nor deeply critical. Notices of valuable books upon biblical literature, and translations and extracts from the works of eminent writers will occasionally form a part of the contents.

It will continue to be edited by some of the members of the Theological School in Cambridge, assisted by the contributions of several distinguished clergymen. Every exertion will be used to secure an interest to the work, and likewise to provide for its regular and punctual publication.

A large addition to the subscription list is still necessary to defray the cost of the publication, and it is hoped that those who approve of the plan will lend their assistance. Clergymen and others are respectfully requested to endeavor as far as their convenience will permit to increase its circulation.

CONDITIONS.

- I. The Scriptural Interpreter will be published on the 15th of every month.
- II. Each number will contain 48 pages 12mo., handsomely printed on good paper and type, making two volumes a year of 288 pages each.
- III. Price two dollars per annum, to be paid in advance.
- IV. Any persons procuring five subscribers shall be entitled to a sixth copy gratis.

TRANSLATION AND EXPOSITION.

MATTHEW XX. 17—34.

The Journey to Jerusalem.

- 17 Then Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve
disciples apart by the way and said unto them,
18 Behold we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son
of man will be delivered up to the chief Priests and
19 the Scribes, and they will condemn him to death,
and deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to
scourge, and to crucify, and the third day he shall
be raised up.
- 20 Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's
children with her sons, and bowing down, asked
21 something of him. And he said to her, What dost
thou wish? She says to him, Command that these,
my two sons, shall sit, the one on thy right hand,
22 and the other on thy left in thy kingdom. But Jesus
answered and said, You know not what you ask.
Are you able to drink the cup which I shall drink?
- 23 They say unto him, We are able. And he says un-
to them, You shall drink my cup, but to sit on my
right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, ex-
cept to those for whom it is prepared by my Father.
- 24 And the ten hearing it were offended with the two
25 brethren. Then Jesus called them, and said, You
know that the governors of the Gentiles exercise

lordship over them, and the great exercise authority
26 upon them. It shall not be so among you, but
whoever wishes to be great among you, let him
27 be your minister, and whoever wishes to be first
28 among you, let him be your servant, as the Son of
man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister,
and to give his life a ransom for many.

29 Then, when they went out from Jericho, a great
30 multitude followed him. And behold, two blind
men sitting by the wayside, heard that Jesus was
passing by, and cried out, saying, Lord, son of David,
31 pity us! And the multitude rebuked them that they
should be silent. But they cried the more, saying,
32 Lord, son of David, pity us. Then Jesus stopped and
called to them and said, What do you wish that I shall
33 do unto you? They say to him, Lord, that our eyes
34 may be opened. Then Jesus, moved with compas-
sion, touched their eyes, and immediately their eyes
received sight, and they followed him.

EXPLANATORY NOTES AND PRACTICAL REMARKS.

Christ, on his journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, had passed through Samaria, and entered the Peræa, the district to the east of the Jordan, and was now returning to Judea, to go up to Jerusalem and attend the celebration of the Feast of the Passover. According to Dr Carpenter, this journey from Peræa to Jericho took place on the 29th or 30th of March. See the parallel passages, Mark x. 32—52; Luke xviii. 31—43.

V. 17. *Took the twelve disciples apart by the way.* Christ frequently spoke to his disciples of his future sufferings and death, at first obscurely, but afterwards more plainly and explicitly. He was accustomed also to speak to them of his return to life, and even of that heavenly life which was to be the reward of all his earthly labors. This he seems to have done for the purpose of removing their former incorrect Jewish notions of the character and works of the expected Messiah, and of gradually preparing their minds for his death.

Had he not thus forewarned them of his future afflictions, 'how would they not have been cast down' when the terrible reality approached!

We do not know the immediate occasion of this discourse of Jesus, but probably the disciples had been congratulating themselves upon the splendid reception Christ would meet with at Jerusalem, and with visions of future greatness. If he was a king, they would be princes! This seems the more probable when we consider the request of James and John and their mother. The mind of Christ was not disturbed by the certain foresight of his approaching death, and he takes this opportunity to correct the erroneous opinions and false hopes of his disciples. He had previously promised them reward in another life for their adherence to his doctrines, but they did not comprehend him, but probably understood him to speak of temporal power, Matth. xix. 28. Now he tells them more plainly of his death and resurrection, and consequently, that they are not to expect earthly power. Yet Luke tells us that 'they understood none of these things,' so deeply rooted were their hopes of a worldly Messiah.

Christ took his twelve disciples apart from the multitude to have the better opportunity of addressing them; besides, there was no reason why the multitude should be informed of his destiny.

V. 19. *They will condemn him to death.* This is not to be understood as implying that the Priests and Scribes should pass the judicial sentence of death upon him, but that they should judge him to deserve it. The power of passing such a

sentence belonged not to the Sanhedrim, but to Pilate. *Grotius.*

And deliver him to the gentiles, to mock, &c. The Gentiles were the Romans: they are called by this title in Acts iv. 27. Christ was *mocked* by Herod and the soldiers. Luke xxiii. 11.

V. 20. *Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children, &c.* Salome was the mother of James and John, and she seems to have been ambitious that her sons should hold the highest places in the kingdom of Jesus which she expected would soon be established. Probably, says Kuinoel, the two sons had persuaded their mother to make this request. Perhaps too their ambition was excited by the marked favor which Christ had always shown these two brothers. They, together with Peter, were admitted to a clearer knowledge of his doctrines and expectations.

They were unwilling to make this request themselves since they had been previously admonished, that the simple, innocent and unambitious were the first in the kingdom of Heaven. See Matthew xviii. 1—3. xix. 60.

V. 21. *Command that these my two sons shall sit &c.* She asked the highest offices in the new kingdom for her two sons. To sit at the right hand of one indicates honor and dignity. The favorite of the king sits at his right hand; he who holds the second place at his left.

V. 22. *You know not what you ask; i. e.* You know not what my kingdom is to be, nor to how many dangers and perils my followers shall be exposed.

Are you able to drink the cup which I shall drink? This might be rendered, *do you wish to drink &c.* 'To drink the cup' was a common figure with the Hebrews. The Psalmist says 'the Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup,' Ps. xvi. 5. David wishing to express his wonder, says 'Thou hast made us drink the wine of astonishment,' Ps. ix. 3.

We are able, &c. Little indeed did they know what it was to drink of the cup they had asked! But their lives show how well they were able to drink of it. They sought earthly powers, and temporal dominion, but

they found a different portion. 'They of whom the world was not worthy, wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and in caves of the earth.' It should be remembered that it is the 'beloved disciple' who now asks for princely power, the same John who afterwards is to teach us to 'love not the world, neither the things that are in the world.' He could afterwards teach men, not only to drink of his cup, but to walk even as he walked.

The phrase *and to be baptized* &c. is omitted by Griesbach. It was probably interpolated to make the passage correspond with the parallel account of Mark.

V. 23. *But to sit on my right hand* &c. Jesus tells them, they shall indeed share his sorrows, but it is not his duty to give to any of the apostles a dignity next his own, except to those for whom it is prepared by his Father. *Rosenmueller.*

V. 24. *Then the ten hearing it were offended* &c. They had mistaken notions of the kingdom of God as well as their fellow disciples, and were no less ambitious of the 'first places;' therefore they were displeased that James and John should attempt to secure the highest honors to themselves.

V. 25. *The governors of the gentiles exercise lordship,* &c. Adam Clarke thinks this means, 'They tyrannized and exercised arbitrary power over the people.' Rosenmueller is of the same opinion.

Jesus commands his followers not to imitate the gentiles' desire to command their fellow men, but, if they desired to excel, to manifest their desire by serving and assisting their brethren, and he proposes himself as an example in this respect. He is certainly to be esteemed the *first* who is the most useful.

V. 28. *And to give his life a ransom for many;* i. e. 'A ransom instead of many;' one ransom instead of the many sacrifices prescribed by the Jewish law, says Wakefield. Perhaps however it is better to suppose *many* relates to the men of all subsequent ages who were to be benefited by his religion, and so indirectly by his death. This agrees better with the context. Jesus says he came not to be

served, but to *serve others*, even to spend his life, and shed his blood in their service. Origen remarks upon this verse, 'The divine discourse teaches us this. That we not knowing the divine will explained in the Scriptures, or despising the advice of Jesus Christ, live so that we seem to exceed the pride of the Princes of this world. So, if we render ourselves terrible and difficult of access unto the poor, and to such as ask favors of us, we are more cruel than earthly kings are to their subjects.'

In several ancient manuscripts the following addition is found. 'But seek ye to increase for a little, and to be lessened from that which is great. Moreover when ye enter into a house and are invited to sup, do not sit down in the highest place, lest a more honorable than thou come after, and he who invited thee to supper come up to thee and say, 'Go down lower,' and thou be put to confusion. But if thou sit down in the lowest place, and one inferior to thee come after, he who invited thee to supper will say unto thee, 'Go and sit higher;' now this will be honorable to thee.' This is the largest addition found in any of the MSS. and is older than the fourth century, since, it is quoted by Hilary, who died about 367, A. D.

V. 30. *Two blind men.* Mark and Luke mention one. Some think that Jesus restored one blind man, before he went out of Jericho, and the other afterwards, and that Matthew mentions both cures at the same time for the sake of conciseness. Others suppose, that Mark and Luke speak merely of one, because one of the two was well known by the name of Timeus' blind son,—blind Bartimeus.

While Jesus was in Jericho probably the interview with Zaccheus took place, which is mentioned in Luke xix.

We are not to suppose that Christ and his disciples were unaccompanied by others in this journey to Jerusalem; probably they travelled with the caravan that went up at the time of the feast. *Paulus.*

V. 31. *And the multitude rebuked them.* Many of the commentators have troubled themselves with the question, Why did the multitude wish them to be silent? Some think they feared it would come to the ears of the Pharisees

that they had acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah, without previously consulting them, which would have been accounted crime. Others think Jesus was at this time conversing with his disciples, and the multitude, holding him in great respect, were unwilling that he should be disturbed.

St. Augustine says upon this passage, 'The two blind men of the way side signify all of both the Jews and Gentiles who agree in the temporal dispensations and who desire to be cured of their blindness: all who desire to know something of the eternal word, which they wish to obtain while Jesus is passing by. They must obtain it by the merit of that faith whereby it is believed that he is the son of God, that he was born a man and that he suffered for us. Men ought to cry out until they overcome the roaring of the crowd that opposes them. With perseverance should they apply their minds to prayer and knocking at the door, so long as they are disturbed by sinful desires, which, like a confused crowd, oppresses the thought that struggles for the light of Eternal Truth. They should continue to cry so long as the crowd of carnal men resists their spiritual desires.'

By right earnest attempts they will at length prevail. As Christ has said, ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.'

V. 31. *Their eyes received sight and they followed him.* As a proof of the miracle which was wrought and of their gratitude. I cannot better conclude this article than by the eloquent words of a late writer. 'Reader, whoever thou art, act in behalf of thy soul, as those blind men did in behalf of their sight, and thy salvation is sure. Lose not a moment, the Lord is passing by, and thou art passing into eternity, and probably thou wilt never have a more favorable opportunity than the present. May the Lord increase thy earnestness and faith.'

The blind are indeed shut out from a world of beauty which is stored with goodly pictures, and choice emblems. The gift of seeing is to them a pearl of great price, an inestimable blessing. But there is a worse blindness than that which seals up the eye of the body! The blindness of the soul brings Egyptian darkness, and worse than Egyptian bondage.

THEO. PARKER.

JEPHTHAH'S VOW—JUDGES XI.

We here have one of those numerous relations of the Old Testament which, either from a mistranslation of the language or a misunderstanding or perversion of the purpose of the narratives, have been made weapons for the scoffer and stumbling blocks for the believer. Still it is true that this like all the other parts of the much abused volume of the old covenant is profitable either for doctrine, for reproof, for correction or for instruction in righteousness. The prejudices in which we have been educated call for some of that attention which otherwise would all belong to our direct instruction, as before we are able to apply the truths of religion, it is no small labor to obtain a clear conception of them. Let us then examine the passage of Scripture before us after the manner of the old preachers, and inquire first for the doctrine, and second for its use.

The history given in this narrative is fixed in that period commencing with the death of Joshua and ending with the accession of Saul to the monarchy, being about 399 years. During this time the Israelites were governed by Judges, the same in name as the Carthaginian suffetes and of like authority with them as well as with the Athenian archons and the Roman dictators. The Judges were chosen for life, but the office was not hereditary. This was a distracted period of the Jewish history. It was unusually, though not altogether, deficient in the influence of men of strong minds, able to form some worthy conception of the vast purposes which the Almighty intended in his dispensations with

the Jews, and disposed to exert their noblest powers for the high success of those purposes. The commonwealth was left at periods without rulers; then anarchy, rebellion and idolatry triumphed over the little acquisitions of former prosperous times. Now the people were in bondage to some barbarous horde around them, and so soon as they were delivered from their servitude they became in their turn oppressors, imitating not only the wrongs but the sins of their enemies, and often uniting the abominations of heathenism with the lofty ideas which had been entrusted to their keeping.

It was during the sixth servitude of the Jews, under the Philistines and the Ammonites that Jephthah arose. It is to an incident in his history that we wish particularly to refer.

Jephthah was a son of Gilead by 'a strange woman,' (Judges xi. 1, 2.) When his father's legitimate children grew up, 'they thrust him out' from the inheritance and he passed over the Jordan into the land of Tob, which was probably the northernmost portion of the tribe of Manasseh. Here we are told that he united himself with a band of vain men, i.e. empty or useless men, a band of roving robbers. The Israelites being at this time oppressed by the Ammonites, sent over to Jephthah, who had probably become celebrated for his prowess, and offered him the command. Jephthah made use of an argument which has lost none of its currency even down to the present day. He reproaches his brethren for their former ill treatment of him in driving him from his father's inheritance, while they court his undeserved assistance in the time of

their danger. Upon their solemn promise that he should 'be head over all the inhabitants of Gilead,' he agreed to accompany them. Having been publicly acknowledged as the head and captain of the Israelites, he sent his message of defiance to the children of Ammon. Their king likewise resorts to a piece of venerable policy. He justifies his enmity by the pretence that he wished to recover the land which the Israelites had wrongfully occupied in their passage from Egypt; truly a singular argument for the time, the country, and the man. Jephthah replies that his people had asked for a peaceful passage through the land, and that this had been denied them, and that consequently trusting in the hand which led them they had possessed the territory by force. His argument was an unanswerable one. He says to the king—'Wilt not thou possess that which Chemos thy god giveth thee to possess? So whomsoever the Lord our God shall drive out from before us, them will we possess.' Again, says Jephthah, 'We have occupied the lands three hundred years, why therefore did ye not recover them within that time?' Jephthah then passes over Gilead and Manasseh to collect reinforcements and to prepare for the combat. In the meanwhile he vows a vow unto the Lord, if he would make him victorious over the Ammonites—'that whatsoever came forth of the doors of his house to meet him when he returned in peace from the children of Ammon should surely be the Lord's, and he would offer it up for a burnt offering.' He was victorious; he smote the Ammonites and completely subdued them, driving them with great slaughter from city to city. As he returned to his dwelling at Miz-

peh—'his daughter came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances; and she was his only child; beside her he had neither son nor daughter.'

Jephthah exhibited extreme sorrow at her presence. He told her that he had opened his mouth in a vow unto the Lord and could not go back. Her reply was alike characterised by patriotism, filial reverence and piety—she would submit to be treated according to the vow. She sought for a period of two months to go about among the mountains where her dwelling was 'and bewail her virginity.'—Her request was granted. When the period had expired she returned unto her father, 'who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed; and she knew no man. And it was a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel, went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year.'

And now the question occurs, was the daughter of Jephthah put to death? Did the father slay his daughter with his own hand or suffer another to slay her as an offering to the Most High God? The common opinion is that such was the case. The unbeliever therefore asks, in what respect were the Israelites better in the worship of such a Being than if they had passed through the fire to Moloch? On what pretence do you offer me a book which contains such narratives, without a rebuke, yes even with an encomium passed upon the heroes of them, as the record of a revelation from the Deity? To answer these objections let us examine the question candidly—Did Jephthah sacrifice his daughter? There are two considerations to guide us.

First—did the terms of Jephthah's vow make the sacrifice of his daughter necessary to its fulfillment?

Second—what was the treatment to which he subjected her?

In the first place, as to the terms of the vow. The words of it are as follows. 'Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering.' From this it was the opinion of the Chaldee commentators, of Josephus and of the Christian Fathers generally, that Jephthah vowed the sacrifice of the object which first met his eye, whether a human creature or a beast. But many Jewish Rabbins and many learned Christian divines, among whom were Grotius, Glass and Le Clerc, have rejected the idea. The original passage admits of another rendering which puts the matter in a different light. The Hebrew particle which joins the two last clauses of the vow is used disjunctively as well as copulatively, and thus may signify *or* as well as *and*. Then the verse would read—'Whatever comes to meet me I will devote to the Lord OR I will offer it up for a burnt offering.' If this be admitted, Jephthah vows to God whatever should meet him, whether a human creature or an animal, but he devotes them in different ways—if his eyes first beheld a fellow being he would consecrate it to God, but if the first object which he met was an animal he would slay it or redeem it by another as it was clean or unclean by the Law.

The following considerations may be offered in support of this rendering of the passage. It is true the Vulgate and the Septuagint have the reading of the

common version but this is of no consequence, as they came from the Hebrew.

1. It may be observed that the original is not in the least tortured by the proposed translation. The translators of our version have given this for a marginal reading. The disjunctive use of the particle (*vau pref. conj.*) is admitted; indeed it is frequent in the Old Testament. As in Exodus xxi. 17, compared with Matth. xv. 4, 'He that curseth father or mother;' and in 2d Samuel ii. 19, 'Asahel turned not to the right hand nor to the left.' In these instances the same particle is used and it is evidently to be understood disjunctively. The corresponding particle in other languages admits of the same use. The Latin *que* must often be rendered disjunctively, as in Virgil, *Æneid.* ii. 37,

Aut pelago Danaum insidias suspectaque dona
Præcipitare jubent, subjectisque urere flammis;

rightly rendered by Dryden

The fatal present to the flames designed,
Or to the watery deep;—

So it is with the Greek *καί*. Schleusner gives several instances of its disjunctive sense under the twelfth signification of this word. Thus if there is no reason drawn from another quarter there can be no objection to the rendering proposed.

2. Jephthah would not have made a vow requiring a human sacrifice for its fulfillment, for he must have known that it would have been odious to God. The sacrifice of children is expressly forbidden in Deuteronomy xii. 31, and there are numerous passages in the

Old Testament which prove that it was held up to the Jews as an abomination ; as in Psalm cvi. 37, 38 ; Isaiah lxvi. 3 ; Ezekiel xvi. 20, 21. Even supposing Jephthah to have been in ignorance upon this point the priests must have informed him better.

3. Again, if Jephthah had devoted in equal terms to death whatever he might meet, he must have been aware of the law of redemption for a moderate sum ; (Leviticus xxvii. 2, 3, 4,) 'He who shall have vowed his life to the Lord shall pay the price that shall be ordained, a man fifty shekels, a woman thirty shekels.'

To the first of these arguments it is said that the rendering proposed is unnatural ; but let any one decide this point to suit himself ; enough has already been said in showing it to be not only natural but of frequent use.

The reply to the second is that God would not desire nor the priests justify a human sacrifice, but that Jephthah might still have vowed and intended one. This is a consideration independent of the text and rests upon probabilities which each one may weigh.

To the third argument it is answered that the right of redemption extended only to things simply devoted but not to those doomed by anathema. As in Leviticus xxvii. 28, 29, it is said—'No devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, of man and beast, shall be sold or redeemed—but shall surely be put to death.'—It is needless to say any thing more than that this cannot be understood as a command for human sacrifices ; indeed we ought probably to take the disjunctive signification of the particle here likewise. After all it is a question whether Jephthah's vow included an anathema.

Now the object which the returning conqueror was most likely to meet, if not a human being, was a dog. This was an unclean beast, and though in Leviticus xxvii. 11, there is provision for the redemption of an unclean beast, yet in Deuteronomy xxiii. 18, the dog is expressly excepted. So Jephthah could not have fulfilled his vow in this contingency if the common opinion of its nature be the true one. Or Jephthah might have met with a bullock, a ram, a lamb, a kid or a goat, but these could hardly be said to come to meet him, or to 'come forth of the doors of his house,' and this consideration likewise points us to a contingent or a conditional vow.

Finally, an animal was but a common sacrifice, and as Jephthah was undertaking an affair of great moment, he would seem parsimonious in his promises if there was not a distinction in the words of the vow.

I know that there are plausible answers to all the arguments I have urged, and I will therefore leave them here. We are told that Jephthah did with his daughter according to his vow, so if we can find out what he did we shall know what he promised. I pass therefore to the second consideration—What was the treatment to which Jephthah subjected his daughter? According to the proposed rendering of the passage, Jephthah was to consecrate a human being and to immolate an animal. On this supposition his vow would have required that his daughter should be destined to virginity. Let us see whether the circumstances and details are in favor of this opinion or of that of her sacrifice.

1. In the first place, as it regards the consecration

of a maiden to virginity, there is a difference of opinion respecting its applicability. Those who maintain that the maiden was sacrificed assert that virginity was not then considered a mark of sanctity as it was in latter times in the Christian Church, and moreover that a man or woman might take the Nazarite vow which was a strict consecration of the person to God, and still be married. To this it may be replied that Jephthah might have designed such a consecration to God though he had had no precedent to follow. We know indeed that the situation to which the maiden would thus have been doomed was one of reproach and sorrow. See Psalm lxxviii. 63; Luke i. 25.

2. Jephthah exhibited extreme sorrow when he beheld his daughter coming forth to meet him. But this will accord as well with the necessity of her being taken from his sight and consecrated a virgin, as with that of her being immolated. Consider that he was a triumphant general, returning in the first flush of his success, filled, in all probability, with schemes of ambition, such as changing his office of judge into that of a monarch, and perpetuating his name and honor in his family. He encounters his only child whom he must devote to a single state. All hope of issue is thus cut off and there is abundant reason for his sorrow.

6. If Jephthah sacrificed his daughter there was an interval of at least two months allowed her.—During this period, supposing he intended her sacrifice, his rashness had time to cool. He might have learnt a better way of exhibiting his gratitude to God; he might have discovered either by reflection or by the study of the Law that the Almighty required no such sacrifice; and

more than all, the advice of the priests must have been interposed. I allow that the expression 'she went to bewail her virginity' is equivocal. It may mean either that she went to mourn the fate which destined her to a single life—or that she lamented in the near approach of her own death the final extinction of her family.

4. But Jephthah 'did with her according to his vow.' He performed what he had promised, his intention whatever it was, was fulfilled. Here then the decision of the matter will rest. What were the consequences of this fulfillment? First we are told 'she knew no man.' Now this expression has a meaning if we suppose her to be consecrated as a virgin, but it is unnatural if she was put to death to say that she remained a virgin. Again we are told that from the fulfillment of the vow a certain custom arose among the Israelitish maidens. The word (*hok*) rendered 'custom' in our translation is often elsewhere rendered *a statute, or an ordinance*. This seems to imply a perpetual institution commemorative of a nation's gratitude. Nothing conclusive can be built upon this word, as either acceptance will apply in both events. The equivocal sense of another word will rather favor the opinion of consecration as a virgin. The daughters of Israel, says our translation, went to lament the daughter of Jephthah. The word here translated '*lament*' means often *to talk with*, so that it might be concluded that the Israelitish maidens yearly sought out their friend among the mountains and condoled with her.

These are all the considerations drawn from the text which can help us to form an opinion upon the subject. We are nowhere told that Jephthah sacrificed his

daughter, and every one must allow that the text leaves some doubt upon it. The story related by Homer of the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father Agamemnon has been thought to be built upon a tradition of the narrative before us, particularly from the resemblance which the name of the Grecian lady bears to Jephthigenia, or the daughter of Jephthah.

The remarks which I have thus far made upon this subject have related entirely to Jephthah's conduct as a question resting upon the interpretation of Scripture. Let us now attend to its bearing as a narrative given to us for our instruction. I have not been at all anxious to disturb the common opinion which supposes the sacrifice of the maiden by her father, from any unwillingness to allow that such a deed might have been committed by a man over whom in the language of Scripture, the Spirit of the Lord had come. This Scripture is profitable for correction and reproof as well as for doctrine. So long as unholy deeds are committed they will not cease to be of use in warning to virtue. If the Old Testament did not contain the narrations which are thought to be so objectionable I should very much doubt its authenticity. If any man through the most marvellous disregard of probabilities seeks in the records of primeval times for the expressions and the customs which suit our present standards of morality, let him go and learn the first alphabet of reason. While I believe it therefore to be very doubtful whether Jephthah sacrificed his daughter, I should not have the least difficulty in admitting that he did. As has already been observed, the state of the times was unsettled, the religious opinions of the Is-

raelites were very obscure, they were deficient in their resistance of bad examples and of idolatrous practices of the nations around them, and unless a visible power had bound them for its absolute slaves, their own voluntary actions must needs have been very questionable. Besides this, Jephthah had not enjoyed even the light which the Israelites possessed. The Tabernacle was at Shiloh a city of Ephraim on the west of the Jordan, and here the public ordinances of the religion were observed. But Jephthah had been born and educated afar off, in the land of Gilead on the east of the river, and when he became of age he was the leader of a band of robbers. Nothing then could have been more natural than that he should emulate the example of the faithful Abraham, and trust that the sacrifice would be the more acceptable to God in proportion as it tried his own heart. He had examples enough around him, of such a mistaken piety—such a mixture of religious feeling with mental darkness. Gideon ‘set up his ephod in his city and caused all Israel to commit idolatry.’ Even in later times those who were chosen for the purposes of God were imperfect in their apprehension of their duty.—‘Ahaz made his sons to pass through the fire according to the abominations of the heathen,’ 2 Kings xvi. 3. Manasseh, besides committing the same offence, used enchantments and witchcraft, ‘and wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord,’ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. ‘Solomon went after the abominations of the Ammonites,’ 1 Kings xi. 5. The moral we are to draw from this is, that we enjoy more light than Ahaz, Manasseh or Solomon. We have views of God, of our duty to him, of the worship which it is most reasonable

to offer to him, in the light of which the natural offspring of superstition and ignorance appears in its true character. It is God alone who has made us to differ, and if we will judge others let us examine them by the light which they had rather than by that which they had not.

But it will be said that in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 32,) Jephthah is mentioned with commendation. He is ranked among the worthies of the old covenant who stand as examples of an all-conquering faith. So he is and justly. It need not be insisted upon here that as we do not know who was the author of this Epistle we should not be bound to acknowledge his authority. Whoever he may have been he asserts of Jephthah only what is strictly justifiable. Jephthah through faith subdued a kingdom. He believed in the God of the Israelites, he called upon him for aid and it was granted. This was all that the writer commends him for, and he cannot be said to approve him any further than for his faith. At the close of the Chapter in the Epistle, we find the words 'of whom the world was not worthy.' But this encomium applies rather to the martyrs who are mentioned subsequently to Jephthah.

From these considerations I think it will appear that the history of Jephthah can furnish no objection to the scoffer, and no cause of distrust to the Christian. The moral of the narrative is open for our instruction. Jephthah mourns at the sight of his daughter—he has made a rash vow, and though according to the principles of a true philosophy he was not bound to keep it, his suffering is the application of a great truth of religion. If we run into temptation, we shall find it diffi-

cult to go back,—if we make a wild and needless promise there will be sorrow in its fulfilment and in its neglect.

GEO. E. ELLIS.

HUG'S INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Translated from the third German edition, by D. Fosdick, Jr.
Andover, 1836.

The object of this work is to furnish an account of the age and genuineness of the Books of the New Testament, and to show that they are credible ; to point out the history of the text, the condition and value of MSS. of the sacred Scriptures, the authority of ancient versions, and to furnish a particular introduction to each Book.

Besides this, there is a short chapter devoted to the principles of criticism, and a valuable collection of notes by Prof. Stuart.

A comparatively large proportion of the work is occupied with accounts of the text, versions, critical apparatus &c. We have to regret the absence of any systematic treatise upon the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament. This appears necessary to give completeness to an Introduction to these writings. The author of the work is a Papist, though, as Mr. Stuart observes, he 'has a kind of Protestant heart,' and sometimes endeavors to make 'a separation' between his *critical* and his *catholic* conscience.' The

work contains much useful matter, for the general reader as well as for the critical scholar, and will no doubt form a valuable accession to our Biblical literature ; still there are some respects in which it seems to fall behind the similar works of Eichhorn and De Wette, notwithstanding the daring criticism of one, and the fastidiousness of the other.

Speaking of the proofs of the genuineness of the New Testament, he divides them into two classes, viz. *internal* and *external* arguments. The following extract contains many useful hints.

'Are now this alleged origin and antiquity justly ascribed to these writings, or have they crept into such repute without sufficient reason ? This is naturally the previous question, lying at the foundation of all other inquiries. If this be answered unfavorably, not only are all our former observations upon the doctrines and designs of Jesus ill-founded, but it will, indeed, be very difficult to discover anything upon which dependence can be placed respecting the system and objects of this sage instructor.

There are two sources of information respecting the genuineness or spuriousness of these writings ; viz. *Internal Evidence*, and the *Testimony of ancient writers*, who have mentioned them and so proved their existence, or have named their authors.

We will first consider the historical books of the New Testament with reference to the *internal grounds* of their genuineness.

Suppose a person should unexpectedly light upon these books without any previous knowledge of them, (the subject is treated much in this way by a late wri-

ter) and, possessing the ability to read them, should open them—what opinion would such a man form as to their origin, antiquity, and authors, merely from their internal character?

They are written in Greek, he would say, and certainly not in any one of the proper dialects of that language, but in a corrupted style of expression and construction, which frequently so much resembles the Hebrew in the use of words and in grammatical arrangement, that one would think their authors were Jews who spoke Greek. They exhibit, too, so little learning and historical art, that it is plain they are the compositions of ordinary men, who, with the exception of some Jewish reading, make no pretensions to education, or attainments in literature. The narrative itself is of such a character that, notwithstanding its brevity, the very air and features of the persons concerned, their attitude and motions, the part of the spectators, the expression of their countenances, their whole behavior, seem to be present before the eyes.—Such would necessarily be the language of one who, with no previous account of them, should pass judgment upon these books from their internal character alone.

And this is exactly what Christians assert respecting them, viz. that they were written by men of Jewish descent, who were all of humble origin and rank, without a learned education, whose knowledge of the events which they recorded was either that of eye-witnesses, or obtained directly from eye-witnesses.

We may argue too as follows: Biographies of remarkable men always present a more or less complete picture of their age and country, the state of civil

affairs and of manners, and other circumstances under which they appeared, with which their life was surrounded and their actions came in contact. In proportion to the intimacy of the acquaintance we possess with all these peculiarities and circumstances, and with the whole picture of the age, we are able to discern whether the writers had seen those days to which their narrative pertains, or how remotely they lived from them. The truth on this point is the more strikingly manifest, the more the biography enters into details, and the more numerous and delicate are the relations under which the personage, who is its subject, appears.

In this view, especial importance attaches itself to the labors of those learned men who investigate the political state of the country in which Jesus appeared ; examine into its social condition and civil regulations, collect together contemporary events which had a more or less close relation to New Testament occurrences and are incidentally referred to in the narrative ; and further, seek out the historical personages who bore a part in the events of the time, particularly in Palestine, and gather together the traces of their lives and character to be found in ancient authors, in order to try the historical books of the New Testament by these data, and to put to the proof the qualifications of their authors.

Now the New Testament writers every where evince an uncommonly accurate knowledge of affairs, and a degree of intimacy with the period to which Christ belongs, such as could be possessed only by contemporaries.

The more one descends to particulars on this point

and observes the developement of the opinions, customs and manners peculiar to this period, in the discourse and actions of the individuals introduced, the more absolutely convinced must he become, that the authors of these books themselves passed their days in the midst of these very circumstances.

On these circumstances depends Christ's conduct as a moral teacher. The demeanor of others towards him and their treatment of him spring from these ; and the descriptions of his solitary situations depend ultimately for their fidelity upon these.

If he falls in company with Pharisees, the mutual deportment of the parties, the truths he presents to view and his application of them, all must be regulated on very different principles from those which guide him when he converses with Sadducees or enters into their society. When he meets with Samaritans, another chain of ideas commences, other circumstances come into operation which give character to his intercourse with them. If he stands among his disciples and addresses the common people, he has to deal with still other hopes, desires, and prejudices, with other moral qualities, and his discourse must run through another circle of thought. In conduct too they must appear a different people ; on one side, with hearts open to the reception of truth, zealous and pious—but on the other, rash, easily inflamed, furious in their religion, and forward to adopt violent measures without regard to consequences.

Now when we gather all from ancient authors that we can find which affords us any light on these points, and then apply it to particular cases in the New Tes-

tament, we find ourselves, in the more trifling as well as in the main incidents, constantly carried back into the circumstances of these days. The Pharisees and Sadducees really appeared and thought just as we see them in these books ; such were the prejudices of the Samaritans, such the mutual ill-will between the Jews and themselves ; such was the spirit of the common people ; and their character lives and moves in the New Testament, just as it presents itself in the history of the times, fickle-minded, hasty, and blind in their passions, showing themselves in relation to two different constitutions, both strictly regardful of duty and completely lawless, and easily excited to tumult and sedition.

So too with the foreign regulations and customs which were introduced into Judea, and gave a cast to the national condition, such as it never had before even in the time of Herod the Great, and never again wore. The vexing *census* exhibits all the freshly-awakened theocratic fancies of the Jews, and paints their feelings towards the Romans, just as they actually were. The precept in respect to reconciliation (Matt. v. 25. Luke xii. 58), has circumstantial reference to the Roman law, by which the complainant was empowered, without the necessity of a summons by the magistrate, to drag the offender with his own hand to the judge. On the way thither he had opportunity to make a composition ; but if this was not effected, a fine was imposed upon him, and, if unable to pay it, he remained in close confinement until it was discharged.

When Jesus converses or associates with publicans, throughout the whole scene the Roman farming-system and its oppressions are presented to our view. Again

when he drives the money-changers out of the temple with scourges, we notice the consequences of Roman supremacy and the influence of foreign manners ; for the *argentarii* of Rome were accustomed to set up their tables, near the statues of the gods, at the feet of Janus (*Horat. Epis. Lib. I. Ep. 1.*), in the most sacred places, and near the temples. We remark also the Roman toleration, which permitted no violation of the temples and religions of other nations, and under the sanction of which a private Jew vindicated without opposition the sacred character of his Temple, which at Rome no laws could protect from desecration.

The parable Matt. xviii. 23 presents to view a king or tetrarch, who as to himself and his own affairs was not subject to the Roman jurisdiction, and therefore proceeds according to the ancient Jewish law. But the sequel, which relates to a private person, is represented in accordance with the Roman statutes against the *obæratos*, by which the debtor who became insolvent was given up to the creditor. The latter then bound him, and kept him in his house as a prisoner, wholly at his arbitrary disposal. The rigor of this statute was, it is true, somewhat mitigated, but afterwards and in the days of which we are speaking, the ancient severity had again revived, as it appears in this moral fiction.

This blending of customs and manners obtained in innumerable other things. Take for example the various kinds of money. We meet at one time with Greek, at another with Roman, and at another with the ancient Jewish coins. But how accurately is this thing too adjusted, according to the circumstances of the times ! The ancient taxes, which were introduc-

ed before the Roman dominion, are estimated in Greek money ; e. g. the temple-tribute, (Matt. xvii. 24. Joseph. B. J. L. VII. c. 6. n. 6). The offerings were made, also, in this money, (Mark xii. 42. Luke xxi. 2). A payment which is made out of the temple-treasury, is made in the ancient national pounds, (Matt. xxvi. 15). But in business, trade, payment of wages, etc. the *assis* and *denarius* and other Roman coins are usually employed, (Matt. x. 29. Luke xxi. 6. Matt. xx. 2. Mark xiv. 5. John xii. 5. 6. 7). The new taxes, likewise, are estimated in the money of the nation which then possessed the sovereignty, (Matt. xxii. 19. Mark xii. 15. Luke xx. 24).

Writers, who in such trifling circumstances (which on any other supposition would have been wholly overlooked) so exactly accord with the truth, must certainly have been personally familiar with them."

He then speaks of the external evidence:

"For the sake of ascertaining how early the New Testament writings were in circulation among the Christians, the works of the oldest Fathers of the Church have been waded through with remarkable patience, and the passages which bear upon this point collected together. A certain Englishman in particular has distinguished himself in this commendable employment. He was soon followed by others, who tested his collection by the most rigid principles and estimated it with critical care.

The results obtained from this collection in favor of the New Testament are well known ; I have therefore determined to add to this proof a second, which will

remarkably corroborate the other and sometimes surpass it in cogency. The earliest ages of Christianity produced a multitude of sects who attempted to unite their philosophical and theurgical opinions with the Christian system, and often involved themselves in whimsical fancies, in beautiful and often ridiculous dreams. Even these sought to ground their positions upon the authority of the Biblical books, and to defend them against different tenets, especially those of the dominant church. Their writings are indeed mostly lost, and were intentionally destroyed, and we do not thank piety for it ; but sometimes zeal in refuting them has saved fragments of their treatises, and their opponents have preserved the arguments which they advanced in support of their opinions. I propose to collect together such passages, which will carry us further back into the antiquity than the writings of the Fathers of the Church who afterwards wrote against them. These present the peculiar advantage of coming from men, who had seceded from the adherents to the common system, and broken off all good understanding with them.

I have granted a place here to those witnesses only, who belong to the second century, and have, indeed, admitted none who did not appear till several years after the death of Commodus. They all appeared as teachers under that Emperor or at a still earlier period under the two Antonines, and their youth fell in the days of Hadrian and Ulpian Trajan, under the latter of whom the last of the Apostles finished his earthly course in extreme old age.

Before I approach my proposed task, it is necessary

to premise some observations on the practice of the oldest christian writers of every sect in respect to biblical citations, so that we may not make unreasonable requisitions of them, and when these are not satisfied, make inferences which are regarded as principles of sufficient solidity to serve as the foundation of a system.

I. They have always quoted the Old Testament more carefully than the New ; because they naturally could not suppose all their readers so well acquainted with the former as with the latter. Many of them even seem to have thought it evidence of erudition and literary display, to accumulate in their works passages from the Old Testament, as, for example, Clement of Rome, Barnabas and Justin. This they have not done as to the New, which was better known.

II. They did not treat the historical and didactic books alike. They have seldom transcribed narrations, either from the Old or New Testament, at full length and in the author's words; and who would expect them to do it? But they have given them in their peculiar manner, sometimes remembering the expression of the writer, and generally abbreviating it.

In such cases the bare conformity of the fact with one of our Gospels is far from being proof that it was really taken from them. It might have been taken from other historical books ; but the circumstances which are mentioned in them depend upon the individual representation of the original author, some of these being selected by one, and others by another, or all being carelessly and summarily presented. Hence they are more definite means of recognizing a writer ; and the style and choice of words are still more deci-

sive. Now if we find, in addition to this, plain resemblances in language and instances of a recall of peculiar expressions, so great coincidence is no longer attributable to chance, and we may with confidence assume that there is a citation of this or that book, with which every thing agrees.

III. They have generally cited the didactic writings of the Old Testament *verbatim*, and the Prophets particularly with direct reference. This was natural ; for who could distinctly recollect passages, so often resembling one another, even if he were ever so familiar with them ? Or who would know where to find them, if the name were not given and the expression faithfully preserved ?

IV. In respect to the Epistles of the New Testament their practice is similar ; they usually cite passages from them accurately. They frequently even refer to their authors by name ; particularly when they do not cite the passages in an exactly literal manner.

V. When they quote moral principles and tenets, they often mind only the thought and disregard the words. Thus, e. g. Tatian in his ' Oration to the Greeks ' maintains the original condition of the human mind to be darkness, and alludes to the Gospel of John. Such is his procedure as to another passage which he has taken from the first chapter of John. (Or. adv. Græc. c. 13 & 19.) The first thing requisite in order to regard such a passage, as a citation, is agreement in thought. If there is still further a resemblance in the costume and in the words employed, there is stronger reason not to regard it as a merely casual coincidence. Yet even this will not be sufficient, unless

such a form of citation, as was customary with the ancients when they referred to passages in the Bible, shows such not very clearly marked passages to be quotations; as, e. g. above, where a biblical sentiment and phraseology is denoted by the formula '*it is said.*'

These forms of citation, are various and we shall lay no stress upon any of them before showing, as we will do in respect to the above, that they were used for this purpose by the ancients.

VI. One species of them merits a particular consideration. The ancients have very seldom, when they refer to the sayings and doctrines of Jesus, named the books in which he is represented as thus speaking. They nearly always quote the person speaking and not the narrator. Most of the citations from the Evangelists occur under the formula: '*Our Lord says,*' '*Our Savior declares.*' &c.; and sometimes perhaps there is added, '*in the Gospel.*' The name of the Evangelist very rarely appears. The writers chose rather to rest their point upon the legislative authority of our Lord, than upon the authority of his biographers.

I have said that most of the citations from the Gospels occur under this formula. This is evident at any rate in Irenæus, a writer of this period, and in the Fathers of the following century. We cannot be wrong, therefore, in inferring that under this formula others referred to written documents respecting the life and doctrines of our Lord. If this phrase had not referred to familiar sources and such as were conceded to be authoritative; if it only referred to oral traditions, it would have been more definitely declared on whose authority an assertion was made.

Now if, under the citation 'our Lord declares' &c. the very same idea occurs which is in our scriptures, and with strong similarities in expression, the greater the similarity in expression and the more numerous the possibilities that a difference in words, in their inflexion and arrangement might have taken place, the more clear it is that the passage must have been taken from our books. All doubt, however, ceases, when, besides identity in the ideas, there is also an identity in the words, in cases where deviations were very easy.

VII. But we must not judge of this identity according to the common printed text of the Elzevirs or Stephens; it is not the proper criterion. The text, as we shall see more fully in its history, had, in the second century and in the beginning of the third, many peculiarities in particular copies, (as in the text of Justin, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus and other Fathers) which have been removed by the revisers of the third century. Hence, if we find discrepancies, they need not trouble us except when they do not appear in other writers of the period or in documents which present a very ancient text. If they occur elsewhere, we perceive that such discrepancies are only variations in ancient MSS. as they were at that time current.'

When he introduces the great apostle to the gentiles he enters at length into an account of his character, p. 505—508, 510—512.

THEO. PARKER,

ON THE GIFT OF TONGUES.

[Translated from the Latin of J. A. Ernesti.]

(Concluded from p. 240.)

But it may be said, that though it was not to *all* the believers an aid in teaching, it may have been designed for that purpose in the case of the *apostles*. Yet Paul says that the gift had been bestowed on him more than on all the rest, (xiv. 18, 'I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all'); and if its object were to assist the apostles in teaching, why was it given in such measure to him, who nowhere preached where there was occasion to use any other languages than Chaldee or Greek; and did not in fact use any other, as is plain from the book of Acts. His teaching was confined within the limits of the Roman Empire, and to countries which were mostly Greek; and at every place he began his teaching with the Jews and in the synagogue, where the Greek language alone was used, as it was also generally known in all the most renowned cities.

For this reason also he wrote to the church at Rome not in Latin, but in Greek. Nor had the other apostles need to use any other language in their teachings, than the vernacular speech of Palestine, or the Greek; in each of which they were enough skilled for this purpose. For among the Jews in Palestine, the Greek language, by much intercourse and trade with the Greeks of Syria, Asia and Egypt, had been long familiarly known. And this will not seem strange to those acquainted with these things. As, in these times, persons of French family, born and educated in Ger-

many, and on the other hand Germans living under the rule of the French in Germany itself, have both languages at command, so far as the needs of human life require ; so the Jews, who at that time were met together at Jerusalem from all parts of the world, were acquainted with both tongues, that, namely, of Jerusalem, and that other in which they had been born and brought up. That it was then no uncommon thing in the East, for two languages to be used promiscuously in the same city or country, is proved among other things by the fact, that in the ruins of Palmyra inscriptions are found both in the Greek and in the native tongue. The Greek would seem to have been sufficient for those too, who carried the Gospel towards the East, even beyond the Euphrates. For those countries had formerly been for some time under Grecian power, and had acquired the use of their language ; and even before they came within the dominion of the Greeks, the commercial intercourse which these last had, from remote times, established in all parts of the earth, opened such a way for the Greek languages, that many of its words were adopted into the Chaldee. Of this we have Daniel for an instance, in whose book some Greek words are found in a Chaldee form. But even if it was of the last importance that they should be familiar with the Chaldee or some similar dialect, it was surely unnecessary that it should be given by divine inspiration.—From which we conclude, that, for purposes of teaching, the Apostles needed no other languages than those which they had acquired by use in their own country.

Of no less importance in deciding this question, is

the observation which many have made : that a divine providence may be seen in the spread of the Greek language over the whole world, which seemed to pave the way for the triumph of the Gospel throughout all lands ; an observation which can mean nothing else, but that the ambassadors of Christ, with that one language, were sufficiently prepared to enter every place and imbue all nations with the Christian doctrine. And if this be so, the gift of other tongues was of no use to them as an aid in the exercise of the Apostolic office—the office of teaching among the gentiles. It is evident at least, that no other than the Greek and vernacular languages were required in those countries, where Jews or those who followed the Jewish rites, are mentioned by Luke. And the apostles, so far as we have certain evidence, do not seem to have advanced beyond the limits of those countries ; but, having founded Christian Churches where formerly Jewish colonies had been, they left to them and their posterity, the duty and the labor of spreading the Gospel more widely. It is clear enough that in the West, at least, they did not go farther than this.—Yet how this may have been is of little importance. Let us rather look into this question : if the gift of tongues was not properly designed for teaching, or for use among those nations whose languages the apostles had not learned, for what purpose was it given, and what special use did it have in the Church?

The first design of this gift, then, related doubtless to those who had believed in Christ, as the apostles and his other friends and followers ; and to those who afterwards believed the apostles, as the disciples of

John (Acts xix.) Cornelius with his friends, and many others: that they might be confirmed in their faith, and have this pledge of the truth. For this cause and on account of these 'gifts,' the Holy Spirit was an 'earnest' of the faithful, (2 Cor. i. 22); and there was in this gift a remarkable testimony which the Holy Spirit gave to the minds of believers, though the truth had indeed its own signs which were clear enough.—Another design, distinctly brought forward by Christ and the Apostles, related to those who had not yet believed. 'Tongues are for a sign to them that believe not,' says Paul, (1 Cor. xiv. 22. Compare Acts v. 32); that, being struck with admiration, they might be induced to reflect and examine, and might find this the first opening to a knowledge of the truth. This design was common to it with those other gifts mentioned in Mark xvi. in which is seen the interposition of some power striking forcibly on the senses. For there is no doubt but the gift of tongues is to be numbered among the 'gifts of the Holy Ghost,' with which God is said (Heb. ii. 4), to 'bear witness' to the doctrine of Christ; and we see how great increase it brought, at the very outset, to the church, when the astonished hearers of Peter's discourse (Acts ii. 41), had known its power and its origin. Both of these designs, however, were frequently accomplished at the same time. Thus at the day of Pentecost, at once the apostles were confirmed by the fulfillment of that promise, which Christ at his ascension, had told them to wait for at Jerusalem,—and so great a multitude were turned to the knowledge and belief in Christ. Moreover, as divine wisdom is wont, so far as may be, to make all things

work together in harmony with its own counsels, so these ends were united in such a way with other parts of religion, that the same gift might be, to each one, the means of enkindling and fostering both his own piety and that of others. For the Spirit of God directed the tongues of believers to speak in strange words during their public worship, when discourses were held concerning religious subjects, or the scriptures were read, &c; and this in such a manner, that the speech should be wholly taken up in praying and praising God and in making mention of his works, his decrees, and his favors bestowed through Christ. That this was so, is evident from all the passages of Scripture which speak of this subject, especially Acts ii. and 1 Cor. xiv. In the former, by 'the wonderful works of God' are doubtless to be understood divine praises, which all celebrated in order; and in the latter nothing can be clearer, than that the reference is wholly to prayer and the praise of God. 'Let him that speaketh in an [unknown] tongue,' says the apostle (v. 13,) 'pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in an [unknown] tongue' &c. Here *speaking* with a tongue, and *praying* with a tongue, are interchanged—a clear proof that they are synonymous; and this is confirmed by the rest, v. 15, 16, &c.—Thus far concerning the end and use of this gift; it remains for us to inquire into its character and mode.

If we look at the instances of those who received this gift, we shall find, that in all of them, it consisted in some motion imparted by the Holy Spirit, which caused the organs of speech to utter divine praises by new and unknown methods, i. e. by unknown words,

spoken without instruction and without previous use. For the same expression is used, as in the case of those who spoke suddenly, by divine impulse, what they had not prepared by meditation (as in Luke i. 41, 42, 67), both are said to have been 'filled with the Holy Ghost,' and there is no difference between the two cases, except that in the one, a known and familiar speech was used, in the other, a strange and unknown. Somewhat otherwise was it in regard to those, who had not first begun to speak thus, but made use of a gift received before; for they are said (1 Cor. xiv. 26), to 'have a tongue.' But the mode is the same; and the discourse was made, not through such acquaintance with that new language, as those would have who had learned it, but through spiritual impulse and divine agency, as in every case of supernatural inspiration. This is a manifest conclusion from what Paul clearly says: that among those who had the use of this gift, were some who could not speak out in their own language, what they had uttered in a foreign speech—which nowise happens with those who have such skill in a language as is acquired by discipline and practice, so that they may use it when and how they please. For they are able to speak e. g. in Latin, what they have before thought upon in their own tongue; and what they have said in Latin, they translate with ease, and interpret into the vernacular speech, and need no other interpreter of the discourse delivered in Latin. It is much the same with those 'interpreters' of whom Paul speaks—who have been the occasion of some difficulty to the commentators. They were not interpreters, such as are commonly called so; but what was said by

another, they immediately, by divine suggestion, rendered into a known tongue, though ignorant themselves of the language whose words they interpreted. Otherwise it had not been a *gift* of the Holy Spirit, such as could be compared with 'revelation' and the like, (1 Cor. xiv. 26), such as could be obtained of God by prayer, instead of being acquired by any previous learning.

WM. SILSBEE.

ON THE BEAUTIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

[From the French of Cellerier.]

Every one knows that our most illustrious poets have never soared so high, as when they have nourished their style from that of the sacred authors, and have attempted to imitate, without even being able to equal them. Every one knows that many celebrated men, weary of all other books, read this alone to the end of their days.

The most confirmed sceptics have been forced to admire the genius of those whose inspiration they despised. The most fanatical of their number placed the Bible in his library by the side of Homer, and the chief of that impious sect, that man, who to escape paying homage to the Scriptures passed his life in travestying it, found there, in spite of himself, words which made him shed tears of admiration. It is there we find the noblest models of the grand. We cannot speak of the sublime without repeating those well known express-

ions : *God said, Let there be light ; and there was light. I am what I am. I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay-tree, yet he passed away, and lo he was not.* What ingenious and touching pictures of patriarchal manners ! They delight the learned and the ignorant ; the old man, and the child. I ask of you, my readers, if any among you have now ceased to read those books, if there is one of you who has not preserved the remembrance of the history of Joseph, of Ruth, and of David,—a shepherd, and fighting the Philistines : of Moses exposed on the banks of the Nile, with nothing to defend himself, but his innocence and beauty ?

It is the Scriptures which offer us in a single word, the philosophy of life. *My days are few and evil.* For so appears the course of life when it is new. What old man does not know the profound truth of those words and apply them to himself ? *All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man, as the flower of grass !* These expressions, a thousand times repeated, still preserve their charm and their beauty, for they reply to our souls.

Where else shall we seek for that seraph pathos, whose impression is so deep ! Abraham leads his only son upon the mountain where he is going to sacrifice him. *My father, says the young Isaac, behold the fire, and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering !* What a question to Abraham !

Charged of God to arouse the conscience of a guilty king, Nathan by an ingenious parable leads him to condemn himself ; then he utters that thundering word which penetrates to the very depth of his soul, and

which re-echoes in the bosom of the sinners of all ages,
Thou art the man.

It is in this same book that I find the prophetic and energetic language of the passions, which is the accent of nature. Jacob served Laban *seven years*—it was to obtain Rachel. *They seemed unto him but a few days, says the historian, for he loved her.* What a picture of the enchantment of innocent tenderness!

How are these words repeated which paint all the tenderness of a mother, *Rachel weeping for her children, would not be comforted because they are not!* And that wailing which comes from the bosom of a father, *It is enough, Joseph my son is yet alive; I will go and see him before I die!* God offended with the Jews threatens to destroy them, and to raise up a new people of the lineage of Moses. *Lord, exclaims that great man, Lord, if thou wilt, forgive their sin, and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book!* Look,—I do not say for an emotion—but merely for an *expression*, of such beauty, of such force—search, in the records of other nations whose patriotism is their only virtue: you will find nothing which approaches it. My readers must thank me for having given them occasion to read over this account again.

Exodus xxxii. THEO. PARKER.

TRANSLATION FROM J. E. CELLERIER'S INTRODUCTION
TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

(Continued from p. 160.)

CHAP. 2.

Errors in the manner of interpreting the Old Testament.

I design in this chapter to point out two common and besetting mistakes, which are the result of an unenlightened faith, and the source of many objections.

ARTICLE I.—ABSOLUTE SENSE.

It is common enough for men to seek at random in the Old Testament, precepts and teachings directly applicable to us and to our time; to see there, in short, without distinction, our rule of conduct, and the truth that shall enlighten us. This is in part the result of those false notions combatted in the preceding chapter. It is, especially, a consequence which naturally flows from the belief in an absolute inspiration of every verse and word. So that this contempt is in fact corrected and this error refuted by what has been said before. At the same time, it may be useful to add here some hasty reflections. To ascribe an absolute authority to the Old Testament is something contrary to the design of God, for it is in opposition to facts. The mere reading of the books thus abused—the taking into view the circumstances in which they were given—the comparison of them with the New Testament—will suffice to show, that God spoke to certain men for a definite time, and imparted truth to them, in proportion as they

were able to bear it. Shall we, who are favored with the more perfect light of the New Testament, and with principles of universal application, attempt to confine and lessen its instructions, by forcing them into the narrow mould which was fashioned to the understanding of Hebrews? Nay, we are rather to explain the Old Testament by the New, than the New by the Old. Jesus Christ came to *fulfill* the law and the prophets, but not to begin them again. This is, in truth, what all are agreed upon in theory; yet in practice it is continually departed from. Some threat of the prophets, or some precept in Deuteronomy, or some declaration in Exodus, is quoted and applied with the same confidence, as if this threat had not been addressed to Judah alone, this precept connected with the Levitical law, this declaration of a mighty and jealous God, designed for those who could not yet apprehend the God of the Gospel.—Let us bear this well in mind: it is in the Gospel that we are to find our Rule; and the teachings of the old covenant can be directly applied, only as they are confirmed, received, and unfolded by the Gospel. Let us beware of disobeying God through excess of fidelity, and of misapprehending his word, by a hasty zeal to reverence every ‘jot and tittle’ of it.—Still more,—it is by restoring the Old Testament to its place, by studying it in its true aspect, that it will appear to us in all its beauty. In order to admire it, we must look upon it as God gave it, in relation to the time and the men of that time. If we displace it, if we make continual application of it to ourselves, Christians of the Gospel and of the four quarters of the globe, if we twist it in order to

make out a precise relation, not with those for whom God designed it, but with those for whom he purposed other and better things,—we throw upon it a false light, we change its proportions, we take away its harmony and grandeur, we call up objections, doubts, and sneers.

* * * * *

ARTICLE II.—TYPICAL SENSE.

Another mistake not less common and of the same kind, consists in searching throughout the Old Testament for types of the Gospel. If we would believe those who hold to this, the patriarchs were types of Jesus Christ; the history of the Jews, a type of the history of the Church; the laws of Moses, the type of the Christian doctrines: every thing in this Old Testament becomes emblematical.

Whether true or false, this method of interpretation cannot be unimportant. It changes the whole face of the Old Testament, the spirit with which we reflect upon it, the rules of its interpretation, the lessons which it gives, the consequences to be drawn from it; every thing is altered by this view. It is important then to have decided opinions on this subject.

Let us remark, in the first place, that this system—so strange it seems—would need to be well proved, before we could admit it. This double history, these laws which are oracles, these men whose actions, course, and fate are determined beforehand, not for their happiness and virtue, but for some foreign and distant end—this doubtless is not impossible to divine power, but it is quite improbable and seems little in

accordance with the aim proposed—say rather, altogether unworthy of God.

If we examine this system yet closer, we are struck with its danger. What a field is open to the imagination! and how may every one wrest, at will, that word which is yet *truth*! which is sent with this title to *sanc-tify* men! Where shall we stop, what rule shall we follow, what limits set to this species of interpretation? To the inspired word, every teacher adds a commentary after his own fashion. Led away by an imagination, pious, perhaps, but lawless, (since it is allowed to invent, and is subjected to no method)—he is free, in fact, to put together, to construct, and embellish at his will. Can it be, that revelation thus treated, should not turn out to be obstructed with tottering, useless, and deformed scaffoldings? Facts speak on this point. Open at random the Fathers who too often were inclined to these allegories, and the modern teachers who imitate them.* Is there not in them

* Here is a specimen of St Augustine's method: 'The Son of God,' says he, 'is called the Vine, for it is he who was figured by the bunch of grapes, which the two spies brought from Canaan, suspended on a stick, to represent the Savior suspended on the cross.' (See his *Enarrationes in Psalmos*.) Elsewhere, he makes still more out of this allegory. The two men who carried the bunch, represent the Jews and the Pagans. He who went in front, with his back to the grapes, is an emblem of the Jews who preceded Jesus Christ, and turned their back and not their face, as God complains (Jeremiah ii. 27.) The Pagans on the contrary, who embraced Christianity, are figured by him who walked behind, with his face towards the bunch. (Vol. x. of his works, ed. of Plantin)—All this, to speak freely, is very much like the commentaries of the Rabbins; in each, a disordered imagination, an absence of reason and taste, and a forgetfulness of the true beauties of the Holy Books.

something repulsive to the upright and judicious man, who, in the word of God, seeks what God has said, and seeks it in sincerity of heart? In order to find the truth, he had taken care to lay aside all prejudices and to put on a serious and earnest temper. Then, applying himself conscientiously to the work, he weighs the words together, compares the context, and sees the meaning at last unfold itself clear and decisive—in accordance with the subject and the occasion, with man and with God.—But no—he is forbidden to go on; and instead of this course, there is suggested to him an interpretation which is strange, far-fetched, and extraordinary, which no method can discover or demonstrate, which is set free from all rules, which confounds all ideas, and to which good sense and clear judgement are obstacles instead of aids! What shall he do? He runs the risk of rejecting the book with the commentary; or else, to keep down all doubts, he gives up examination and stifles his reason. The enemies of Scripture have often charged it with obscurity, seeing the various positive and literal interpretations, which party passions had attempted to give it. How would it be if this manner of commenting were generally adopted! And this is still more pernicious, as this abuse leads to another; the imagination once set in play, has no inducement to stop, and from the typical sense they have seldom failed to pass to the double sense. Some interpreters have given at once two senses, many senses, all possible senses, to the same passage. The marvellous once introduced into the very words of Scripture, instead of resting in revelations and facts, men have commented as imagination

led them, very much as the Scribes whom Christ censures. They have wished to reduce the Law of God to an ambiguous and equivocal form, which would be a disgrace to any human law; and upon this Bible, the work of the Most High and resplendent with his glory, they have deeply stamped the broad and obscure seal of human passions and errors.*

In fact with this method there is no longer any truth, for the meaning is sought by chance, or rather drawn out by lot, by the imagination alone. There is no longer beauty—for the harmony of the whole, the following out of God's counsels, the simple and pure sensibility of the poets, the touching charm of the histories, and above all the truth, the positive and persuasive truth—vanish beneath these obscure and troubled clouds. Soon, doubts come in and thicken in the darkness. It thus becomes too sure a way of bringing contempt on the Old Testament. When the pedants of past centuries had transformed the *Iliad* and the *Æneid* into a collection of allegories, admirers disappeared, and the despisers of antiquity sprung up in crowds.

WM. SILSBEE.

* Calvin, whose good sense, sometimes so remarkable, has often combatted, by anticipation, the exaggerations of his successors,—in commenting on 1 Cor. x. 11, takes great care to explain this verse in the sense of *examples* and not of *types*, and he adds: 'I know very well that others philosophize more subtly on these words. But it seems to me that I have apprehended the sense of St. Paul.'

MISS MARTINEAU'S PRIZE ESSAYS.

Just published by OTIS, BROADERS & Co. 147 Washington street, Prize Essays—No. 1. The Essential Faith of the Universal Church. No. 2. The Faith as unfolded by many Prophets. No. 3. Providence as manifested through Israel. By Harriet Martineau. 1 vol. 18mo. pp. 554, full cloth, 75 cents.

ADVERTISEMENT.

In March 1830 the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association offered a premium for three tracts, to be approved by them, the object of which should be the introduction and promotion of Christian Unitarianism among the Roman Catholics, the Jews, and the Mohammedans respectively. Each of the essays was to be sent to the Committee with the name of the writer in a sealed note, which would be opened only after the decision in favor of the successful candidate.

Miss Martineau obtained the three prizes. The celebrity which she has acquired in this country by those of her works which have been reprinted here has induced the belief that these Essays would be read with interest, although if they had come from an unknown author the nature of the subjects might prevent their general circulation. The ability, the tact, and the fine spirit which they display must increase the admiration of Miss Martineau's talents which already prevails among us. For grasp and vigor of thought, for a rich and felicitous style of expression, and for general power of argument, without the slightest mixture of asperity or unfairness, they will bear comparison with almost any writings of the same class. The author has judiciously adopted a different method of treating each subject, and may therefore expect that opinions will be various about the comparative merits of the three Essays, according to the intellectual habits or tastes of readers. But no one can fail to pronounce them all remarkable productions. E. S. G.

UNITARIAN BOOKS—AT A REDUCED PRICE.

Sermons, accompanied by suitable prayers, designed to be used by families. By Rev. J. R. Beard, 87 1-2 cents a vol.—Retail price \$2.

Christ and Christianity—sermons by W J Fox, 2 vol 12mo. \$1—retail price \$2.

Christian Morality, sermons by W J Fox, 1 vol 12mo.—50 cents—retail price \$1.

Whitman's Village Sermons, 1 vol 12mo.—42 cents—retail price 75 cents.

Sermons on the doctrines and precepts of the gospel, by J. Farr, 1 vol 18mo—25 cents—retail price 50 cents.

Plain Letters on important subjects, by J Farr, 25 cents—retail price 50 cents.

Whitman's Letters to a Universalist, 1 vol 12mo 60 cts—retail price \$1.

Worcester's Last Thoughts, 1 vol 12mo—50 cents—retail 75 cents.

Mrs Farrar's Life of Howard, published in Ware's Sunday Library, 1 vol 18mo—37 1-2 cts—retail 62 1-2 cts.

Ware's Discourses on the offices and character of Jesus Christ, 1 vol 12mo—25 cents—retail price 50 cts.

Miss Martineau's Times of the Savior, 1 vol 18mo—20 cts—retail 37 1-2 cts.

Sewall's Daily Devotions, 1 vol 18mo—50 cents—retail price 75 cents.

Contemplations of the Savior, 1 vol 12mo—50 cents—retail price 75 cts.

Sermons by the late Rev A Abbott of Beverly, 1 vol 12mo—37 1-2 cts—retail \$1.

Priestley's Views, with a Memoir by H Ware, jr. 1 vol 12mo—60 cts retail \$1.

Channing's Discourses, 1 vol 12mo—87 1-2 cts—retail \$1.

Ware on the Christian Character—30 cts—retail 50 cts.

Ware on extemporaneous preaching—25 cts—retail 37 1-2 cts.

Offering of Sympathy—50 cts—retail 75 cts.

Dewey's Sermons—1 vol 12mo—\$1 12 1-2.

SUNDAY SCHOOL BOOKS.

About one thousand volumes of Juvenile works, adapted to Sunday school Libraries, which will be sold at 50 per cent discount. School teachers about replenishing their Libraries, would do well to call.

A few complete sets of the Scriptural Interpreter can be furnished at 62 1-2 cents per vol, in No.—Persons wishing for sets or back volumes to complete their sets, can be supplied.

E. R. BROADERS, 147 Washington st.

